

OPINION 917

CYATHOCRINITES MILLER, 1821 (CRINOIDEA): DESIGNATION OF A TYPE-SPECIES UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers all designations of type-species for the nominal genus *Cyathocrinites* Miller, 1821, made prior to the present Ruling, are hereby set aside, and the nominal species *Cyathocrinites planus* Miller, 1821, is hereby designated to be the type of that genus.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Cyathocrinites* Miller, 1821 (gender: masculine), type-species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Cyathocrinites planus* Miller, 1821 (Name No. 1914);

(b) *Temnocrinus* Springer, 1902 (gender: masculine), type-species, by original designation, *Cyathocrinites tuberculatus* Miller, 1821 (Name No. 1915).

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *planus* Miller, 1821, as published in the binomen *Cyathocrinites planus* (type-species of *Cyathocrinites* Miller, 1821) (Name No. 2397);

(b) *tuberculatus* Miller, 1821, as published in the binomen *Cyathocrinites tuberculatus* (type-species of *Temnocrinus* Springer, 1902) (Name No. 2398).

HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 1795)

The present case was submitted to the office of the Commission by Prof. N. Gary Lane in March 1967. Prof. Lane's application was sent to the printer on 3 May 1967 and was published on 20 September 1967 in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **24**: 237–238. Public Notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the present case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the other prescribed serial publications (Constitution Art. 12b; *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **21**: 184). The proposals were supported by Dr. Porter M. Kier and Dr. John W. Koenig. Dr. Henning Lemche commented as follows:

“It seems to me that there is no case at all concerning *Cyathocrinites*. The alleged type designation by Roemer does not state that he (Roemer) did consider *Cyathocrinus tuberculatus* as type. To do so, Roemer should have written ‘—indem ich—’ (= ‘—since I—’) and not have used the third person word ‘man’, which latter does not convey the necessary authority to the statement. So, I propose that the Commission simply confirms that Roemer's action did not constitute a type-selection—which would solve our immediate problem.

“If, however, Roemer did select many types in the same manner, and his actions have been accepted by others, it might perhaps become necessary some day for the Commission, under the plenary powers, to rule that his action is to be taken as valid in some specified cases. But that possibility does not affect the present case.

“The formal proposals, according to this viewpoint, would need correction as follows:

(1) Place the following names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:

- (a) *Cyathocrinites* Miller, 1821 (gender: masculine), type-species as designated by Wachsmuth & Springer, 1880, *Cyathocrinus planus* Miller, 1821;
 - (b) *Temnocrinus* Springer, 1902 (gender: masculine), type-species by original designation, *Cyathocrinites tuberculatus* Miller, 1821.
- (2) Lane's proposal (3), unaltered."

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 16 June 1969 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (69)30, in part 1 either for or against the proposition that Roemer validly designated the type-species of *Cyathocrinites*, and in part 2 either for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 24 : 238. At close of the prescribed voting period on 16 September 1969 the state of the voting was as follows:

Part 1. Affirmative votes—nine (9), received in the following order: China, Holthuis, Obruchev, Melville, Alvarado, Sabrosky, Mertens, Kraus, Ride.

Negative votes—seven (7): Lemche, Vokes, Mayr, Starobogatov, Binder, do Amaral, Forest.

Part 2. Affirmative votes—fourteen (14): China, Holthuis, Lemche, Eisenmann, Vokes, Mayr, Obruchev, Melville, Alvarado, Binder, Sabrosky, Kraus, Forest, Ride.

Negative votes—two (2): Starobogatov, Mertens.

On Leave of absence—one (1): Tortonese.

Voting Papers not returned—four (4): Bonnet, Evans, Munroe, Simpson.

Commissioners Brinck and Jaczewski returned late affirmative votes in parts 1 and 2. Mr. Eisenmann abstained from voting in part 1. The following comments were made by Commissioners in returning their voting papers:

Mr. E. Eisenmann (1.vii.69): "Lane's translation of the German seems adequate, and were it English I would consider Roemer's phraseology a modest way of selecting a type. However Lemche may be right, for the overtones and subtleties of German usage are beyond my competence. Rather than make a decision that could affect other cases, I prefer to avoid voting on part 1, but favor use of the plenary powers under part 2".

Prof. Ernst Mayr (22.vii.69): "I vote for use of the plenary powers in part 2. The reason being that the Wachsmuth and Springer designation is not much better than Roemer's designation of 1851. All they said was 'ought to be the type of the genus'. No [Ashmolean] specimen can be the 'type of the genus'—it is better to eliminate all past uncertainty and set aside all previous designations in favor of *planus*."

Mr. R. V. Melville (29.vii.69): "I think Dr. Lemche will find that many designations of type-species have been made (and subsequently confirmed by usage) in impersonal English, French or German, and such forms of expression ought not to be criticized simply because the first personal pronoun has not been used."

Dr. C. W. Sabrosky (28.viii.69): "In my opinion, Roemer's action falls under Art. 69a(iii). He said 'since' not 'if', and his 'man . . . betrachtet' is merely a roundabout way of saying that *tuberculatus* was then being accepted as type-species of *Cyathocrinites*."

Prof. Per Brinck (22.ix.69): "It has been an act of humility not to write 'I' for centuries, and it is still so for many (people and languages), so I doubt whether it is wise to invalidate the type designation for such a semantic reason."

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for names placed on Official Lists by the Ruling given in the present Opinion:

Cyathocrinites Miller, 1821, *Nat. Hist. Crinoidea*: 85

planus, *Cyathocrinites*, Miller, 1821, *Hist. Nat. Crinoidea*: 85

tuberculatus, *Cyathocrinites*, Miller, 1821, *Hist. Nat. Crinoidea*: 88

Temnocrinus Springer, 1902, *Am. Geol.* 30 : 94.

CERTIFICATE

We certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (69)30 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in part 2 of that Voting Paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 917.

R. V. MELVILLE

Secretary

W. E. CHINA

Assistant Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

London

4 December 1969